One j. ide has six and the other side hag four. It is divided between the two sides—four for the Opposition and six for the ruling party—and it goes as per the conventions and traditions, by the strength of the political parties represented in this House. So, the first four parties from the Opposition are represented.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : महोदया, इसमें प्रतिपक्ष का व्यापक प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं है, इसलिए इस कमेटी को विस्तृत करना चाहिए और प्रतिपक्ष के ज्यादा लोगों को इसमें लाना चाहिए। ...(व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : आप बैठिए ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : लेकिन यह तो अन्याय है । आप चाहते हैं कि यदि यह बढ़िया से हो तो उसमें प्रतिपक्ष का प्रतिबंध अवश्य होना चाहिए और कम से कम 1/3 आप अवश्य रखिए, बेशक आप 2/3 रहिए, लेकिन प्रतिपक्ष एक-तिहाई अवश्य रहे ।

उपसभापति : अब आप बैठिए । The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 30 members; 10 members from this House, namely: —

1. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
2. Shri Mirza Irshadbaig
3. Shri Bhagatram Manhar
4. Shri P. N. Sukul
5. Shri Thindivanam K. Rama-murthy
6. Dr. R. K. Poddar
7. Shri G. Varadaraj
8. Dr. G. Vijaya Mohan Reddy
9. Shri K. G. Maheswarappa
10. Kumari Saroj Khaparde

and 20 members from the Lok Sabha;

that in order to constitute a meeting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that in other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Select Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Chairman may make;

that the Committee make a report to this House by the first day of the last week of the 145th Session of the Rajya Sabha; and

that this House recommends to the Lok Sabha that Lok Sabha do join in the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by the Lok Sabha to the Joint Committee. "

The motion was adopted.

STATEMENTS By MINISTERS Contd.

III. Re. signing of the I. N. F. treaty in Washington ou December 8, 1987, between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Madam Deputy Chairman, on 9-12-1987, P. M. made a statement in both the Houses of Parliament on the signing in Washington on 8-12-1987, of the INF Treaty between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Re-agen. In response to requests for certain clarifications in the Rajya Sabha, P. M. assured the House that a comprehensive statement would be made shortly, j am making this statement in fulfilment of that assurance.

The Treaty provides for the elimination of all land-based intermediate and short-range nuclear missiles hav-

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

ing a range between 500—5500 Kms. and deployed by the two sides anywhere on the globe. The Treaty further prohibits the parties from producing these missiles in the future. Lt specifies that neither party shall produce or flight-test any intermediate or short-range missiles or produce any stages or launchers of such missiles.

The intermediate range missiles systems are to be eliminated in two phases over three years and the shorter range systems within a single 18-month period. The intermediate range missile systems covered by the Treaty for elimination are the U. S. Pershing-II and Ground Launched Cruise Missiles and the Soviet SS-20, SS-4 and SS-5 missiles. The shorter range missile systems covered are the US Pershing-IA and the Soviet SS-12 and SS-23 missiles. The Treaty provides for specific commitment and procedures for the elimination of missiles, launchers, support structures and support equipment.

The Treaty is of an unlimited duration. However, a party may withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the Treaty have jeopardised its overriding interests.

An unprecedent feature of the Treaty is its elaborate provisions for verification, including on-site inspections, in order to monitor compliance with it. A separate Protocol to the Treaty sets forth the procedure for conducting agreed on-site inspections, including short notice inspections and continuous monitoring.

First of all, in order to verify the initial exchange of data on the specifications and locations of the missiles, the two sides have thte right to conduct on-site inspections of agreed locations listed in the Memorandum of Understanding within three months after the Treaty enters into force.

Secondly, there is a provision for the verification by the two sides, of the destruction of missiles and launches at the specified sites where they would be collected for elimination.

Thirdly, after the missiles, launch-ers, support equipment and support facilities are eliminated, the parties have the right to conduct on-site inspections to observe that the prohibited activities have actually stopped.

Fourthly, the Treaty provides for both sides to establish a system of resident inspectors, continuously to monitor missile facilities on each other's territory in order to ensure that these facilities are not performing any INF-related role. The Treaty identifies for monitoring sites where intermediate range missiles are now being produced as well as those where long range missiles are produced currently but which can also be utilised for producing intermediate range missiles.

For 13 years after the Treaty enters into force, the United States and USSR are entitled to conduct a specified number of short notice inspections per year at agreed locations. National Technical Means (NTM) of verification will continue to be used as the principal method of monitoring compliance with the Treaty. The two parties have undertaken not to interfere with each other's National Technical Means of verification and to take specific steps t_0 enhance each other's ability to monitor by NTM.

The talks between USA and USSR to limit their nuclear forces had begun in Geneva in December, 1981. They remained suspended after November, 1983 when USSR withdrew from these negotiations following the decision by the United States and NATO to deploy Pershing-II and Ground Based Cruise Missiles in Western Europe. The negotiations were resumed in January, 1985 following an agreement reached between the Foreign Ministers of the two count-

ries. The objective of th$_e$ negotiations as agreed between the two Foreign Ministers was, to "Work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arm$_s$ race in space and terminating it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear arms... ". Further, the two sides expressed the belief that th$_e$ negotiations "should lead to the complete elimination of nuclear arms (everywhere. "

At the Summit meeting between US and USSR in Reykjavik in October 1986, the two leaders came very close to a far-reaching agreement that could have paved the way for complete elimination of all nuclear weapons. However, the agreement could not be clinched because of the unwillingness on the part of the United State$_s$ to accept restrictions on sts Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) Programme and the insistence by USSR that its Reykjavik offer was a package deal that could not be discussed piecemeal.

Prospects for an agreement on Intermediate Nuclear Forces improved after USSR announced, in February this year that it was willing to delink negotiations on INF from its demand for curbs on the SDI programme.

USSR further agreed to drop its earlier demand that the nuclear arsonale of UK. and France be included within the scope of these negotiations. The United States subsequently suggested that shorter-range missiles should also be covered by the Treaty. USSR agreed to this demand in July 19B7. Finally, USSR also agreed to extend the coverage of the prohibition from Europe to the whole world, as preferred by the United States in an attempt to allay the misgivings of some countries friendly to it, that 9n agreemen on Euro-missiles would mean a deflection of pressure elsewhere. With this "global double zero" offer by USSR, the way to an INF Treaty was cleared, through a number of problems, particularly those 'relating to verification and the pace and time-frame of destruction, remained to be resolved. In the detailed negotiations, both sides accommodated each other's concerns and made the concessions necessary for reaching a final agreement on the Treaty.

The significance of the Treaty lies in the fact that for the first time, there will be an actual reduction in the number of nuclear weapons deployed and the elimination of one category of nuclear weapons altogether. Earlier agreements between the two Superpowers had merely set limits or ceilings to the expansion of the existing arsenals of nuclear weapons. Moreover, the Treaty demonstrates that given the political will, doctrinnaire considerations such as the imperative of "nuclear detcrrance" or technical problems such as verification, need not stand in the way of nuclear disarmament. Though the Treaty covers a ve'ry limited number of nuclear warheads—about 2, 000 out of the total of almost 58, 000 in the possession of the Super Powers—its political and psychological significance transcends the number. It opens up prospects for undertaking more far reaching measures of nuclear disarmament. Finally, the improvement in the relations between the two Supe'r Powers that this Treay reflects, cannot but have a positive impact on the general climate of international relations and security.

The INF Treaty is also significant for the unprecedented verification procedures provided in it. These provisions will go a long way towards restoring confidence between the two Super Powers arid paving the way for concluding agreements on the elimination of other categories of nuclear weapons. They also constitute an important breakthrough in disarmament negotiations in general.

As the House is aware, ever since Independence, India has attached great importance to the objective of nuclear disarmament. This has been a major plank of our foreign policy. As early as in 1954, Prime Minister

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

Jawaharlal Nehru gave a call for the banning of nuclear weapon tests. Since then we have been one of the etaun-chest proponents of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We believe that this would be the most important step towards curbing the qualitative refinement and continuous modernisation of nuclear arsenals. India played a leading role in getting a resolution adopted by the General Assembly in 1965, declaring the use of nuclear weapons as a crime against humanity. We have also taken the initiative in putting forward a number of proposals for halting the nuclear arms race and preventing nuclear war. These proposals, which include non-use of, and freeze *on* nuclear weapons, have been adopted year after year in the form of resolutions by the General Assembly of the United Nations, by an overhelming majority.

We, therefore, regard the INF Treaty »s a vindication of our stand on nuclear disarmament. We can rightly claim that the efforts made by us together with other nonaligned and neutral countries and the peace-loving people all over the world, to mobilise international opinion in favour of nuclear disarmament, has played no small role in bringing about this Treaty.

Wc have, therefore, both on our own and as a member of the Six Nation Initiative, welcomed this momentous development. We did so immediately after an agreement in principle, was reached on the subject following a meeting between the US. Secretary of State and the Soviet Foreign Minister in Washington on September 18, 1987. A little later, we joined the leaders of the Six Nation Initiative, in characterising this agreement as a historic first step in the direction of our common goal, namely, total nuclear disarmament. Further, in a joint message to President Reagon and General Secretary Gorbachev on December 7, prior to the Summit Meeting, the leaders of the Six expressed the hope that the Summit Meeting would yield a spirit in which much more far-reaching disarmament agreements could quickly be elaborated and concluded.

The most important question before us now is whether this Treaty will be followed by more significant reductions ^ of nuclear weapons, leading to their complete elimination. Prospects for an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction of strategic nuclear weapons accompanied by an extension of the ABM Treaty for an agreed period of time in order to provide stability, are claimed to be good. However, even if this is achieved, it would still leave large arsenals of nuclear weapons in the possession of the nuclear weapons States.

In considering the long term impact of the INF Treaty we cannot but be concerned by some of the recent trends. While the Treaty eliminates one category of nuclear weapons, the nuclear arms race shows no sign of receding. Efforts are continuing to develop the space arm of the nuclear far-fighting machinery. At the same time, new offensive nuclear weapons are being developed and refined. The technological arms race is proceeding unabated, covering both nuclear and conventional weapons.

We have als$_0$ to keep in mind that this modest though historic step towards nuclear disarmament, has provoked thrill cries of a fear of denuclearisation. Other nuclear weapon States like the United Kingdom and France, while welcoming the INF Treaty, have stressed their determination to retain their respective independent "Nuclear Deterrent".

It is. therefore, clear that the journey towards the goal of complete elimination of nuclear weapons is going to be a long and arduous one. But there is no alternative to preserving with this journey with renewed vigour and faith. I would like to assure the House that India will continue to pursue through all available means,

our long-cherished goal of a nuclear-free world. We will continue to work tirelessly to achieve this objective through the six Nation Initiative, the forthcoming Third Special Session of the UN General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament and the Nonaligned Movement.

While working for nuclear disarmament, we have also to think about the management of a nuclear-free society. That is why in his congratulatory message to Genera] Secretary Gorbachev, our Prime Minister stated that the world needs changes of attitude, policies and institutions to usher in a nuclear-free and non-violent world, as enunciated in the Delhi Declaration. He then called upon all nations nuclear and non-nuclear—to engage in a serious dialogue for this purpose.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Jaswant Singh,

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, the words "historic occasion, historic development" are actually much overused a[nd] quite frequently ill used. Nevertheless, the present treaty is perhaps one such occasion where the words "truly historic" are applicable. As the hon. Minister has pointed out the recently concluded INF Treaty is perhaps the most significant agreement since the ABM Treaty and SALT Treaty. It goes further and it is, as quite rightly pointed out by the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs the first time ever that the two super powers have actually agreed not to j'uet limit nuclear weapons but actually to cut back on them and there I think lies the true historic import of this Agreement, even if the weapons to be so cut back are of the intermediate range variety and constitute not even 3 per cent of the total nuclear arsenals of the super powers, leave alone the independent nuclear powers. Madam, therefore, I join the hon. Minister in recording our sense of high appreciation of this great development. I do have a few queries which I would request the hon. Minister to clarify.

It might on the surface of it sound parochial that when the concern itself is so holistic, I should be raising limited queries, but because of the Government of India's unconditional welcoming of this development, in my mind are created some doubts about the regional imperatives and national interests. Sir, is it correct that the two signatories, the two super powers to this treaty have agreed and have publicly stated, that as a follow up to the INF treaty, will actively discourage further proliferation of nuclear weapons? If that be so and if the welcoming of the INF Agreement by the Government of India should be so unconditional, where will all this leave the Indian position in the context of the Sino-Indian nuclear question and the potential of the Indo-Pak nuclear question? And that is where the regional and the national imperatives place a quesion mark on the Government of India's unconditional welcoming of this and that is also why whereas the Government is fully entitled t<j engage in a bit of self-congratulation, as it has done in para 18 of the hon. Minister's statement, I would have thought that perhaps the occasion merited a certain degree of reticence and caution and not the kind of a self-eulogy which para 18 contains.

My second clarification 'relates to the question of verification. I think the hon. Minister of State is eminently right when he pointed out that in the field of verification, the two super powers have really taken a very bold and very meaningful initiative on the aspect and he has provided all the details So those do not merit reiteration. My clarification is, one of the initiatives of the six nations related specifically to providing verification offers to the two super powers that in case they are not able to arrive at a mutually agreeable, acceptable verification method, then the six nations' initiative could act as a kind of an umpire, a referee, can act as a kind of an agency that could provide the necessary verification. *(Time bell rings).* Madam, would you take off

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

the time that the hon. Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs has eaten?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He was requesting the Minister to be more attentive to you.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, none of the Ministers is attentive.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH; Madam, I am very attentive.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, one of the principal planks of the six nations' initiative is this offer about verification. Now that the superpowers have actually demonstrated a very significant, a very meaningful and a real progress on the question of verification, where does it leave the six-nation initiative?

My third question, clarification, relates to the following. During this INF treaty discussions or subsequent to them, there were also discussions between the two leaders on eliminating regional tensions and particularly, specific discussions were held about the continuing imboglio in Arghanis-tan. Would the hon. Minister clarify to us further as to what his information, the Government of India's information is on that aspect of the INF treaty discussions?

Finally, it is a bit of a technical question. I do not really know whether this is the 'right forum to raise it in. I leave it to the hon. Minister to judge it. The SDI aspect has been compromised over. So far as the interpretation of the ABM treaty is concerned, which is the interpretation which has left tne SDI issue open? Is it the closed interpretation or the open interpretation of the ABM Treaty? Thank you.

डा० बापू कालदाते (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभापति महोदया, जो ब्यान मंत्री महोदय ने दिया है उससे यह लगता है कि सर्वसाधारण रूप से जो यह ट्रीटी हो गयी है उसका स्वागत किया गया है लेकिन मैं इस बात को मानता हूं कि सही कारण इसका एक है कि एक तरफ जो हिन्दुस्तान जैसे देश हैं जिन्होंने शुरू से ही निरस्त्रीकरण तथा अणु के खिलाफ अपनी भूमिका अदा करने का प्रयास किया और साथ ही साथ खासकर जो यूरोपीय देशों में जनमत बहुत तेजी से और तीव्रता से संगठित हो रहा है उन दोनों का समुचित असर इन दोनों पर पड़ा है ऐसा मैं मानता हूं। मुझे याद है जब रशिया में चर्नोबिल की घटना हुई तब युद्ध के बारे में इस्तेमाल करने वाले अस्त्रों के बारे में नहीं बल्कि जो देश इसको शांत करना चाहते हैं उनके खिलाफ एक बहुत बडा आन्दोलन सारे यूरोप में मैंने स्वयं देखा है। उसका यह भी नतीजा है कि जिन छः देशों के साथ मिलकर हम इस प्रयास को कर रहे हैं उसमें से स्वीडन में तो यह फैसला हो गया कि आगे पीस में भी काम आने वाले अणु का प्रयोग हम नहीं करेंगे। यह जो दबाव बढ़ता जा रहा है दुनियां में जनशक्ति का, मैं स्वयं मानता हूं इसकी तरफ हमारे जैसे देश और दुनियां में बढ़ती हुई जनशक्ति जो इसके खिलाफ जा रही है उसका ही यह परिणाम है। इसके लिए मैं ऐसे देश और जनता का खासकर अभिनन्दन करता हूं जो देश और जो जनता इस दबाव को बढ़ाने का प्रयास करने लगी है।

मेरा एक ही सवाल है जिसका जिक्र आपने किया है सारे बयान में और जो देश हमसे सम्बन्धित हैं जिसका जिक्र श्रीयुत जसवंत जी ने किया है कि इस पर रोक लगनी चाहिए, यह करना चाहिए वह करना चाहिए, ठीक बात कही है लेकिन हम जानते हैं कि पाकिस्तान इसका प्रयास कर रहा है, हम जानते हैं फ्रांस को इससे छट्टी मिल गयी है, हम जानते हैं इजराइल में भी इस तरह की कोशिश हो रही है, हो सकता है उनके पास भी अणुशस्त्र रहे, इन देशों के संबंध में हम खुद क्या करने जा रहे हैं इसके बारे में इस बयान में कुछ नहीं कहा गया है। क्या हमारी बगल में यह होता रहेगा ?

चाइना, भारत और पाकिस्तान की बात है, इजराइल की बात है तो दुनिया में कितना भी भला होता रहे फिर भी हमारी सुरक्षा, हमारी अखंडता और हमारी आजादी को इसमें खतरा है इसके बारे में सरकार क्या करने जा रही है यह मेरा आपसे सवाल है।

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, Deputy Chaimran, I welcome this historic treaty INF between General Secretary-Gorbachev and President Reagan. The world does not want another war, especially a nuclear war. The world wants peace. We do not want another Nagasaki or Hiroshima to happen. As a first step this treaty leads towards world peace and disarmament. It attaches far-reaching importance to world peace. Today the world is facing immense problems, especially poverty and a threat of world war. This treaty will reduce the accumulation of nuclear armaments and help nations of the world to build a new world, a new society, a new mankind. In this regard we welcome this treaty wholeheartedly. This treaty has been achieved after many efforts not only by these two super powers but by the whole mankind, by all nations, by all peoples of the world. As a result of these efforts this historic treaty has been concluded and it is a good gesture. We congratulate both the leaders, General Secretary Gorbachev of USSR and President Reagan of United States of America. There are certain good provisions in this treaty, especially the inspection clause. It is a very important clause and it should be teMctly adhered to; otherwise, tho re may again develop a danger of nuclear war in the world. So this clause should be strictly implemented and attention should be diverted towards elimination of all destructive weapons. We want a peaceful, nonviolent, world. This desire has been expressed by many nations. In Delhi declaration Comrade Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, jointly declared this desire for world peace with this Government when he visited India. In that declaration it has been clearly indicated that we want a nonviolent world, a peaceful world. To that extent this is a very important treaty. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister that some of the nations have still reserved their views on this treaty, especially France and Great. Britain. Mrs. Thatcher, Prime Minister of Great Britain, has announced, while welcoming this treaty, that she will go ahead with the nuclear weapons programme. I would like to know from the Minister whether, since we have close relations with Great Britain, India will bring! pressure on Great Britain to see that Great Britain adheres to the provisions of this treaty and works for elimination of nuclear weapons. I would also like to know from the Minister whether, taking a lead from this treaty, whether India and Pakistan will work for mutual understanding, fo'r reduction of weapons, for reduction of arms, so that these two great countries which are similarly situated—both these countries are suffering from poverty, from illiteracy—save money and utilise those savings for the development of their respective countries.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): The Treaty of INF signed between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan on December 8, 1987 3g an unprecedented and historic one. The threat to the very existence of human life has been greatly reduced by this historic treay. The hope for disarmament and world peace has caused immense pleasure in the hearts of the people on account of this treaty. The treaty is no doubt on the lines of Delhi Declaration signed by our honourable Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, and the General Secretary of USSR, Shri Gorbachev. That is why our honourable Chief Minister, Dr. MGR, has rightly pointed out that the contribu-tion of our Prime Minister towards this treaty is laudable. Even though it is a treaty for the destruction of nuclear weapons to the extent of three per cent, no doubt, it

(Shri Aladi Aruna *alias* V. Arunachalam)

has laid the foundation and given the green signal for the destruction of the entire nuclear weapons in future.

While we are happy with this treaty, the unfortunate thing is that the other two important countries, the two developed countries, -France and England, have not come forward to reduce the nuclear weapons possessed by them It is a disastrous attitude on the part of these two developed countries. So, on behalf of India, we appeal to them to share the views ard policies of these other the two superpowers.

The policy of our country from the beginning to ban the nuclear weapons was mooted by our former Prime Minister, Panditji. Now w» see the success of our policy. So, we are much happier than any other power, any other country, on the globe. Here, Madam, our Minister has narrated some measures taken by tha two superpowers regarding monitoring of destruction of weapons and also of elimination and inspection. In this connection, I would like to know whether any third country or third power is allowed to monitor and verify the elimination and destruction because the implementation of the treaty is very important. If the treaty is not properly implemented, all hopes will be shattered. That is why I want to know whether any opportunity is given to a third country, especially a non-aligned country, to allow it to cooperate with the superpowers in this area.

Once again, on behalf of the AI-ADMK, we welcome this and thank the Minister for having given this statement, Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Now, Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA '(West Bengal); Madam Deputy Chairman, I have no hesitation in calling this agreement a historic agreement although it is a fact that the agreement accounts for the elimination of only three pec cent of the mis-. siles- in lhe -world. Even then I call it historic. because this 13 the first step by the two great powers on disarmament in modern history since the Second World War. Therefore, it shows that the- American war-mon-gers had to come to senses as a result of the movement growing in the world on peace and the ice has started melting. Therefore, in this background, I call it a historic agreement end from that point of view, I cannot agree with the submission made by one of my friends from this side of the House that the significance of the agreement is sought to be overemphasised, and that, in a sense, it is not historic though it is very important. I do not agree with that argument. Secondly, I also do not agree with the argument put forward from this side of the House that India should have the right to produce nuclear weapons since something is taking place in Pakistan. I believe that it is not by producing nuclear weapons that we can fight Pakistan, that we can fight tile aggressiveness of Pakistan, but i* is the international movement iar peace which is the guarantee for the protection of peace in this region of the world. Therefore, this is my disagreement with one of my friends on this side of the House. On the other hand, I believe that there should be only a joint supervision by the Soviet Union and the United States which is the only guarantee, in the ultimate analysis, for the destruction of these armaments. But there should have been a multi-lateral agency also. At leastMadam, there should have been & provision for the involvement of the United Nations in the whole thing. This is an important point which we

should take into considers-12. 00 NOON tion. But while coming tolie statement issued by our Minister, I believe that this is an essay on the whole development. Government of India has not taken cognizance of some of the important factors that led to this development. It is quite well known that the step taken by the Soviet Union by de-

linking I. N. F. from S. D. I, created the situation for the Agreement. Therefore, Soviet Union should have been given due weightage or appreciation— ffl5t just call them two great powers. It is something putting the two at par. We should have given greater appreciation to Soviet Union, which the Government of India in the statement has not given.

Secondly, the Government of India has rightly expressed its apprehension about the preparations for space war. But who is responsible? Here, again, th$_e$ Government of India is conspicuously silent to identify the American war-mongers. Here, again, Soviet Union an^ America have been placed at par. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he agrees that by de-linking INF from SDI. the Soviet Union has cleared the way for the signing of the Agreement.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: If you see, I have said that it is possible...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Let me conclude. I have seen what you have written. I understand. I understand what he has written. But it should be said that it is because of the step that the Agreement became possible. It is something to be stated as a fact; it is something for the Government of India to state categorically. He has been stating facts. But there should have been a conclusion.

Thirdly. Madam, at the end of the statement there is an important element that is missing. Government of India, as a leader of the third world movement and movement of non-alignment, should have called for international vigilance to ensure that the rgreement is carried out. Government of India should have given due role to the international public opinion, to the international peace movement, of which non-alignment movement is a part. *(Time bell rings)*-Here, again, the role of the international peace movement, the role of the common people who are fighting for peace in Europe as well as in America, has not been taken cognizance of.

I would like to know from the Government of India whether they would lik$_e$ to pay importance to the international movement for peace—not only the role of the States. What about the role of the people? What about the role of the people of the world as well? This is a point *o which I shall draw the attention of the Government,

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ram Chandra Vikal.

श्री राम चन्द्र विकल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, माननीय राज्य मंत्री श्री नटवर सिंह जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है उसका सदन तो स्वागत कर ही रहा है सारे देश की जनता भी उसका स्वागत करती है । जो समझौता दो देशों में, जनरल सेक्रेटरी गोर्बाचेव और प्रजीडेंट रगन के बीच में हुआ है यह संस र की मानवजाति की भावनाओं के अनरूप ही हुआ है । मैं जसवंत सिंह जी की इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूं जो उन्होंने कुछ आत्म-प्रशंसा की बात कही है मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि भारत की जनता जहां के आधनिक और प्राचीन महापुरुषों, नेताओं की भावना सदैव विश्व-शांति की रही है, वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम् सारी वसुधा अपना घर है, अपना परिवार है यह भारत के महापुरुषों, ऋषि-मुनियों की भावना है दुनिया ने हमेशा हमेशा माना भी है कि हम इसी बुनियाद पर विश्वशांति चाहते हैं । भारत अगर दुनिया में शांति चाहता है तो इसी भावना से चाहता है कि सारी दुनिया अपना परिवार है और परिवार में कहीं भी कोई संकट होता है तो उसको वेदना किसी न किसी रूप में ह ही जाती है । सारी मानवता को अपना परिवार मानने के सिद्धान्त को लेकर चर्चा आई है जिसमें भारत के पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू, स्वर्गीय ण स्त्री जी, श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी और राजीव गांधी जी की समा को यही भावना रही है क्योंकि भारत विश्वशांति चाहता है । च हे दुनिया के अन्दर कहीं भी युद्ध हो लेकिन उसके दुष्परिणाम तो सब जगह होते हैं । दूसरा महायुद्ध भार की भूमि पर तो नहीं लड़ा गया था। भारत की सीमा से

[श्री राज चन्द्र विज्ञ]

बाहर लड़ा गया था लेकिन उसके दुष्परिणाम भारत को भोगने पड़े । एक भयंकर बीमारी इन्फ्लुएंजा के नाम से उस युद्ध के बाद आई, संवत 1975 में उसे बोलते हैं । पता नहीं कितने गांवों में चिराग जलने बंद हो गये । हमारी मां घटना सुनाया करती थी । तो मैं स्वयं भी भुक्तभोगी हूं । मेरे पिता जी, मेरे बड़े भाई मेरे चाचा जी, मेरे मामा, परिवार के पता नहीं कितने आदमी उसी बीमारी में समाप्त हुए जो कि दूसरे महायुद्ध के दुष्परिणाम के रूप में भारत आई थी । मां तो कहती थी कि हमने रोना बंद कर दिया था । एक का संस्कार करते थे तो दूसरे को ले जाते थे, किसका रोना रोयें किसका न रोयें । ऐसी वीभत्स घटनाएं देखी हुई हैं और श्मशानों की सीमाएं होती थी कि एक संस्कार हो गया तो साल दो साल में कभी नम्बर आयेगा । तब तो चिताएं कितनी जल रही थी यह भी नहीं कह सकते थे । ऐसे दुष्परिणाम भारत भोग चुका है और भारत ही नहीं सारी दुनिया में इसके प्रत्यक्ष और अप्रत्यक्ष कुप्रभाव पड़ते हैं । इसलिए भारत हमेशा विश्व शांति की भावना रखता रहा है ।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूं वह यह कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी जी गोर्बाचोव के साथ मिले यहां भी और वहां जाकर भी । गांधी जी का सिद्धांत सारी दुनिया में मानवता के लिए था । महावीर स्वामी जी का अहिंसा का उद्देश्य भी यही था । हमारे जितने महापुरुष हैं चाहे जो भी हों सबकी यही भावना रही है । अभी गांधी जी की बातचीत उनसे हुई और मुझे भी सौभाग्य मिला रूस में जाने का, कुछ अपने विचार देने का । भारत की तरफ से राजीव गांधी जी का जो संदेश लेकर मैं गया उसमें यह लिखा हुआ था कि रूस और भारत मिलकर दुनिया में शांति स्थापित कर सकते हैं ।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (डा० बापू कालदाते) पीठासीन हुए]

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, 1970 में दुनिया के विश्व शांति सम्मेलन में जो फीजी के गुरु ने जापान में टोक्यो में बुलाया था उसमें भी मुझे जाने का सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ था । जापान के ऊपर जो एटम बम गिरे थे वे अमेरिका ने डाले थे लेकिन खुशी की बात यह है कि अमेरिका के लोग भी उस विश्व शांति सम्मेलन में मौजूद थे । महोदय, आज भी चाहे अमेरिका की जनता हो, चाहे रूस की, चाहे दुनिया के किसी देश की हो, युद्ध और विभीषिका को कोई नहीं चाहता । सारी मानव जाति दुनिया में शांति चाहती है । इसी संदर्भ में दो महापुरुषों ने अपनी संधि की है जिसकी चर्चा माननीय राजीव गांधी ने की है । समय समय पर उनकी चेकिंग होती रहेगी और वे देखते रहेंगे । लेकिन उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो शंकाएं आपको हैं वे हमको भी हैं । जो हमारे पड़ोस में घटनाएं हो रही हैं चाहे पकिस्तान में हों, चाहे खाड़ी देशों में, ईराक और ईरान के बीच में हो लेकिन जो यह कुछ हो रहा है उसमें अगर कहीं ऐसे खराब हथियारों का इस्तेमाल किसी भी तरफ से हो तो वह विश्व शांति में या इस समझौते में बाधक तो नहीं होगा, ऐसी ही कुछ दो चार संदेह की बातें हैं । बाकी किसी को इस समझौते पर दुख नहीं है, सारी दुनिया इसका स्वागत करती है । हमारा सदन, सरकारी पक्ष, विपक्ष सब इसके हामी हैं, सारी दुनिया के लोग इसके हामी हैं । लेकिन फिर भी जो जरूरतें हैं पूर्ण रूप से उनके बारे में कुछ नहीं सोचा गया है, भविष्य में इनके बारे में क्या सोचा जायेगा ? इसके अलावा एक शब्द और कहना चाहूंगा कि सारी दुनिया में भारत की या और जो हमारे देश हैं भविष्य में इन अस्त्रों के खिलाफ ज्यादा से ज्यादा जनमत बनाने में इनकी क्या भूमिका होगी ? इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूं ।

DR. R. K. PODDAR (West Bengal): jMr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I heartily welcome the statement made by the hon. Minister on the floor $_0$f the House on the INF Treaty signed by Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Reagan_ i with the Minister would have commented a little more on how this historic document came into existence. The statement says. - "There are not many parallels in history when a superior power is willing to reduce its arsenal", Sir, you know that the Soviet Union is

going to destroy about 2000 missiles while the United States would destroy about 600 to 700 missiles.

Sir, this ha$_s$ happened because the Soviet Union from its very birth is following the policy of peace. Just on the second or the third day of the success of the Revolution, Lenin declared a decree on peace but nobody took him very seriously because it was a very weak State, at that time and they tried to destroy it in its infancy. But, however, the socialist system proved its worth and became ultimately a stronger force. Now the a'her side, the imperialist side thought that the Soviet Union is going to capture the whole world, instigate aggression everywhere, as Mr. Reagan said at one time. Now it is good that he has changed his mind #nd believes that the Soviet Union is not going to commit aggression anywhere in the world. In this context, a small step, as the (Minister has stated, has been taken to have a nuclear weapons free world. But many steps still remain to be taken. Still Mr. Reagan is insisting that he will go on with the Star Wars programme. There is no agreement yet on the chemical and biological warfare programmes So, unless all these things are eliminated, still there will be scope for suspicion -on both the sides, and the arms race will continue. So, I would request the Government to be careful to get to know which side is on peace and which side is creating obstacles for the march towards that universal disarmament. And, I think, the Government would not falter in rinding out who our real friend is. Sir, you know that the United States is still instigating various forces in India which tend to destabilise our social structure and political structure. Added to this, it jg still continuing with the Star Wars programme and chemical and biological warfare programmes. So, I would request the Government to mobilise the Indian people and generate a national consensus on these points., jjhank you, Sir.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार): उप-सभाध्यक्ष जी, 8 दिसम्बर को जो वाशिंगटन में दो शक्तियों के बीच में आणविक हथियारों के परिसीमन पर जो हस्ताक्षर हुआ, जो संधि हुई उसका तो स्वागत चारों तरफ हो ही रहा है और उसका होना चाहिए अगर सही इरादे से किये गये हों।

मुझको लगता है कि सही इरादे से यह किये नहीं गये हैं क्योंकि पैराग्राफ चार में जो बयान मंत्री जी का आया है उससे स्पष्ट लगता है कि कभी भी किसी समय संधि रद्द की जा सकती है अगर उनके हित कहीं टकराते हों या उनका हित कहीं प्रभावित होता है। यह वाक्य बहुत खतरनाक है क्योंकि बड़ी शक्तियों का हित ऐसा व्यापक है दुनिया में और उनका हित एकमात्र यह है कि उनका बाजार चाहे संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका हो या यू० एस० एस० आर० हो उनका हित है बाजार—वह तीसरी दुनिया को अपने बाजार के तरीके से लूटना चाहते हैं। इस संबंध में डा० लोहिया ने बहुत स्पष्ट कहा है कि यह दोनों शक्तियां अगर मिल जाएं और मिलने के बाद वह चाहें कि सारी दुनिया का शोषण कर लें आर्थिक तरीके से भी तो वह कर सकते हैं। इसलिए हमको इस बात में शक है कि ये सही मनों से किए गए हों। हालांकि यह बात जरूरी है कि यह एक स्वागतयोग्य कदम है और इस दिशा में उनके कदम आगे बढ़ते हैं तो यह मानवता के हित में ठीक है और पूरी दुनिया के हित में ठीक है। इसमें शक की गुंजाइश नहीं होगी लेकिन जो पैराग्राफ 4 में लिखा गया है और 4 की बात सही है तो वह कभी भी कह सकते हैं कि इस सीमा के बाद जाने पर इस सीमा के बाद जब हम निरस्त्रीकरण करेंगे तो हमारा हित टकराता है तथा हमारे हित की हानि होगी और वह वहां से पीछे लौट सकते हैं। मेरा तो बिल्कुल यह निश्चित मत है कि पिछले जितने प्रयास हुए हर प्रयास में अमरीका पीछे भागता रहा और स्टारवार की घोषणा करता रहा जिस पर सारी दुनिया में चर्चा होती रही थी कि अमरीका स्टारवार करके दुनिया को बर्बाद

[श्री राम अवधेश सिंह]

करना चाहता है। लेकिन फिर वही एका-एक उसके मन में मानवता के प्रति प्रम उमड़ आया। क्या ऐसी बात है? नहीं है? 19 अक्तूबर को वाल स्ट्रीट न्यूयार्क में जो 22.6 प्रतिशत उसके शेयर मार्केट में गिरावट आई, उसकी अर्थ-व्यवस्था का दीवाला निकल गया तो उसको एक जरूरत पड़ी कि अब एक तत्काल संधि के लिए हमको आगे बढ़ना है। क्योंकि अगर अमरीका निरस्त्रीकरण की ओर आगे नहीं बढ़ता है तो उसके यहां अगले दो-तीन साल में ऐसी स्थिति हो जाएगी कि कंप्लीट दिवाला निकल जाएगा और यह मैं मानता हूं, आप जानते हैं डा० लोहिया के इतिहासचक्र में उन्होंने स्पष्ट लिखा है कि जो बड़ी मशीन की सभ्यता चलेगी तो उसका अंजाम यही होगा और मोड आफ प्रोडक्शन अगर एक हो और उसका रिलेशन आफ प्रोडक्शन भी न हो तो भी नतीजा एक ही निकलेगा। रूस के यहां जो मोड आफ प्रोडक्शन है वही मोड आफ प्रोडक्शन अमरीका के यहां भी है। अमरीका में भी एक आदमी बटन दबाता है तो दो सौ आदमी काम करता है, रूस में भी एक बटन दबाता है तो डेढ़ सौ आदमी काम के बदले काम करते हैं। एक आदमी अमरीका में दो सौ आदमियों के बदले काम करता है और रूस में एक आदमी डेढ़ सौ आदमियों के बदले काम करता है। इसका नतीजा क्या है कि वहां जो पैदावार होती है कंज्यूमर गुड्ज की या हथियारों की...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (डा० बापू कालदाते) : आप दूसरी चीज में जा रहे हैं। आप अपने को सीमित क्यों नहीं करते, आप खुद को मर्यादित क्यों नहीं करते? आप समाप्त करिए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मैं उसी चीज पर आ रहा हूं। उसका अंजाम महोदय, यही होगा कि दोनों ताकतें बाजार खोजेंगी। अगर बाजार नहीं मिलेगा तो उनका प्रोडक्शन स्टेंडस्टिल में आ जायेगा, जहां का तहां खड़ा हो जाएगा और आगे नहीं बढ़ेगा। तो हम मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहते हैं कि इसमें भारत की भूमिका क्या है? इस बात को मानकर चलिए कि अगर दोनों ताकतें मिल जाएं जैसे सैकण्ड वर्ल्ड वार में मिली थीं और सारी दुनिया का आर्थिक शोषण करने का नक्शा बना लें और इसमें तो तीन परसेंट हथियार रद्दी कर रखा है तो उस तीन परसेंट से तो उनका कुछ बनने या बिगड़ने वाला नहीं है। लगता है दो हजार हथियार नष्ट करेंगे। मगर उसमें तीसरी दुनिया को नेतृत्व देने का काम भारत को करना चाहिए। इस दिशा में मैं चाहता हूं कि भारत की भूमिका क्या होगी क्योंकि यही एक देश है जो कि तीसरी दुनिया को नेतृत्व प्रदान कर सकता है। जैसे भारत गुट निरपेक्ष आंदोलन को आगे चला रहा है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इसमें भारत की भूमिका क्या है? बिना किसी का पिछलग्गू बने या किसी का समर्थक बने बिना हमको एक स्पष्ट और साफ चेहरा रखना चाहिए और मजबूत स्टेंड रखना चाहिए कि हम किसी के साथ नहीं हैं। दुनिया को मानवता को बचाने के लिए हम इसमें भी अगुवाई करेंगे जैसे यह निर्गुट देशों का जो सम्मेलन है या जो संगठन है उसमें हम अगुवाई करते हैं। धन्यवाद।

श्री विश्व बन्धु गुप्ता (दिल्ली): यह तो अमरीका वालों ने डालर की कीमत खुद घटाई है राम अवधेश सिंह जी।... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : डालर की तो घटाई है लेकिन शेयर मार्केट में जो गिरावट आई है, दोनों में फर्क है। वह तो जापान का मुकाबला करने के लिए डालर की कीमत घटाई है।... **(व्यवधान)** ...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (डा० बापू कालदाते) : राम अवधेश सिंह जी, यह चर्चा का विषय नहीं है। इसकी चर्चा अलग समय में करिए।

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Vice-Chairman, on. behalf of Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, I join ^he hon. Members in welcoming the signing of the INF Treaty between Mt. Gorbachev and President Reagan. I heard on the television that only 3

per cent of the total armament is decided 'o be eliminated. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is correct. Secondly, the other grey area in my opinion is in paragraph 2e of the statement of the hon. Minister which says: Other nuclear weapon States like the United Kingdom and France, while welcoming the INF Treaty, have stressed their determination to retain their respective independent "Nuclear Deterrent". The hon. Minister has also stated that we would continue to work tirelessly • to achieve this objective through the Six-Nation Initiative, the forthcoming Third Special Session $_0$f the UN General Assembly Devoted to Disar-mament and the Non-aligned Move-ment. I would like to know if India would use its influence both in the Six-Nation Initiative and in the Third Special Session of the UN General Assembly so that States like France and the U. K. also agree to this so that we may reach somewhere nearer our goal, which has always been our stand. I would also like fo know what other concrete steps India would like to take for similar treaties in other respects. I would like to take this opportunity to know the reaction of the Government of India with regard to the latest step taken by the U. S. in not equating India with Pakistan but at the same time, extending 4. 02 billion dollars' aid to Pakistan. The House would like to know the reaction of the Government of India on this because we may not have another opportunity to know the Gov-ernmen"s reaction.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am grateful to the hon. Members, Shri Jaswant Singhji, Shri Kaldateji. Mr. Reddy, Mr. Das Gupta, Mr. Aladi Aruna, Shri Vikalji, Dr. Poddar, Shri Mattoji and Shri Ram Awadhesh Singhji, for the interest they have taken in this deba'e. If the hon. Members would read my statement, 1 think I have referred to all the matters that have been raised except one with regard to what happens in the region. In paragraph 13 I have said that it was the Soviet Union which said that it would delink negotiations on INF from its demand for curbs on the SDI programme. I do not know why our friend from CPI raised this matter because it is quite clear that the Soviet Union leadership and Mr. Gorbachev have made a far-reaching pronouncement in this regard. We must also realise that this is a treaty between two sovereign countries. It is not a. treaty in which an$_v$ other country is involved, and if they decide at any time that they have to re-think on this, it is their prerogative.

With regard to the efforts that we have made, in my statement I have said that ever since Independence, this has been one of our cardinal principles towards nuclear disarmament. Panditji said so in 1954. We have pursued this in all the international forums, whether the U. N., whether the Non-aligned Movement, whether in the Commonwealth or the Six-Nation initiative. One hon. (Member asked whether we have got public opinion in favour of this agreement. Yes. We have, I have said in para 18 "We can rightly claim that the efforts made by us together with other non-aligned and neutral countries and the peace-loving people all over the world, to mobilise international opinion... " This is what we have been doing. This has been our effort and we will continue to do so. The six-nation initiative will have another opportunity to deal with ail these aspect; next month in Sweden when the leaders of these countries meet there. I also mentioned in my statement that the journey towards complete elimination of nuciear weapons is going to be a long and an arduous one. This is the first step. But this is a significant and an important step when we see what has been going on in the past. A few months ago, it was inconceivable that such a treatv could have been signed. Now, the follow-up action is also being taken. Mr Gorbachev, on his return journey, met the leaders of the Warsaw Pact and they have also

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

agreed to sign their part of the thing. Mr Shuitz was in Brussels where the NATO countries have gone along with the agreement. Before the next summit, discussions on the 50 per cent reduction—this is where the IBM treaty is linked with it—will continue. Therefore, the climate is a right one. Both the countries have taken the vital first step. This is where the rounding of the square will start. This is the first step taken to clear the hurdle. In any major political undertaking, the most difficult step is the first step. Once you take the first step, other things start falling into their places. But I am not for a moment suggesting that things will happen quickly. That is why I have been quite careful in my statement that we will continue our efforts. The principal responsibility, however, is on the two super-powers. I have al^{s0} referred to the fact that France and the U. K want to continue with their independent nuclear deterrent. There i$_s$ some fear that if denuclearisation takes place, these European powers will have some problems. We do not agree with this assessment. We have t$_0$ take these leaders at their word. Mrs. Thatcher has welcomed this and said that we are living in historical times. The Foreign Secretary $_0$f the U. K. has signed day-before-yesterday the portion they had to sign Mr. Shuitz was there at that time.

Now, in regard to the regional question, I want to be very careful and guarded on this because both the super-powers have identical, almost identical, views on the NPT. We have our own views on the NPT. It can be said now that after the INF has been signed, at least a part of article 6 of the NPT has been fulfilled. But we will look at this very carefully and take a decision when we see that definite steps have been taken at the next summit for the 50 per cent reduction, that there is elimination of nuclear weapons in outer space and in other areas. Unless all this is done, our problems are not resolved. While the two-powers may have similar views on the NPT, it doeg not mean that we will abandon our stand on the NPT unless we are fully satisfied from the point of view of our vital national interests. We will look at this very carefully. While we welcome this very much, I cannot give any more information to hon. members because the Indian stand on the NPT must not be linked with this. We welcome this development. But any attempt to link our stand on the NPT with what has happened in the case of the INF would be some thing which, from our judgement, does not necessarily follow. Until and unless there is an agreement on the basis of a time-bound and phased programme for the elimination of all nuclear weapons from all parts of the world we cannot say that the right kind of climate has been produced for us to take a stand. I am not saying that we have a closed mind on this, but we are looking into this very carefully. In all the discussion that we have had, it has not been mentioned that there is yet another power in our part of the world, that is there is the People's Republic of China. We have also to look at their future programmes because as we have maintained from the beginning, we do not consider the nuclear question a bilateral question or even a limited regional question; it is global question. But this i$_s$ for the first time, since the nuclear weapon$_s$ were introduced i$_n$ August, 1945 when bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that a decision by the two most important nuclear powers in the world has been taken to eliminate one set of nuclear weapons, not their reduction. So, we welcome this development. If there is all round progress, certainly there will be no need for any regional powers to go in for any nuclear programmes. Ours is, of course, a peaceful nuclear programme. It is others who have got weapons' nuclear programme who have to be addressed. There is no need addressing India on

thi;; NPT because for Us the NPT remains [a] discriminatory treaty which asks us to do things which the nuclear weapon powers are not doing between themselves. Now the first step has been taken. That is why we attach the highest importance to it and that is why we have welcomed it in the terms that I have stated in my statement.

At the same time, there are other areas where much remains to be done in the field of nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament. This is what we should go on relentlessly trying, and also wish the two super powers who have taken this step, all the good luck in their efforts so that human-kind can get rid of the threat which has brought the world to near annihilation and the fear of a nuclear holocaust has been one of the principal worries that human-kind is facing.

Jaswant Singhji asked whether there has been any discussion between the leader$_s$ of the U. S. A. and the Soviet Union on Afghanistan. Yes, they had discussed, but I did not touch upon this point because this did not fall within the purview of my statement. I must say that both sides have kept us informed of the discussions that were held at the Summit on Afghanistan. A$_s$ the House knows, with Afghanistan we have very friendly ties, historical, cultural, and linguistic. Since independence we have had very good relations with them. It is a non-aligned country. Therefore, what happens in Afghanistan is of vital interest to us. We are an interested party in the eventual solution of Afghanistan and our commitment is to an independent, sovereign, non-aligned Afghanistan and we are working for that.

SHRT KAPIL VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): I want to know the Government's response t$_0$ the new six-year waiver to Pakistan by the U. S. Senate and the Pakistan's new atomic nuclear plant.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. BAPU KALDATE): No discussion. We go to the next item. Mr. Jaswant Singh.

I. STATUTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING DISAPPROVAL OF THE FINANCE (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 1987,

I I THE FINANCE (AMENDMENT) BDUL, 1987.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan); Sir, I move the following Resolution:

> "That thi$_s$ House disapproves of the Finance (Amendment) Ordinance, 1987 (No. 6 of 1987), promulgated by the President On the 19th September, 1987. "

Sir, my reasons for this Motion of disapproval fall i$_n$ various categories. The first one is related to a point of order which was raised by my esteemed colleague, Shri L. K. Advani early at the commencement of this particular Session.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): Sir, is it not necessary that th$_e$ Minister should also move the Bill?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. BAPU KALDATE): No, after this, he will move the Bill and the discussion will continue on both the motions together.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: So, Sir, as I was saying, my esteemed colleague, Shri Advani, at the commencement Of the Session, had raised certain objections about fiscal ordinances and the Chair was then pleased to make some observations on the question of fiscal ordinances. I believe it is in order for me to reiterate the essence of those objections, because in the parliamentary history of our